DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 267 TM 810 163

AUTHOR Robertson, Angelika
TITLE The Relationship of Selected Attitudinal Variables to Verbal Class Participation of Female College Students.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New England Educational Research Association (Lenox, MA, April 30-May 2, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; *Attitudes; *Class Activities; Classroom Observation Techniques; *College Students; *Females; Higher Education; Persuasive Discourse; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Evaluation; *Student Participation; *Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Assertion

ABSTRACT

The extent of class participation of a group of college women is measured, and attitudes associated with high participation are identified. The following are studied: (1) Are high participant women (HPW) more assertive than low participant women (LPW)? (2) Do HPW hold more liberal views on women's roles than LPW? and (3) Do HPW have a more positive attitude toward the process and purpose of intellectual argumentation? Fifty-two female college students in eight seminar-type classes were observed for 30 minutes on two separate occasions. Assertiveness was measured with the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule, attitudes towards women's roles were measured by the Spence-Helmreich Attitudes Toward Women Scale, and attitude towards intellectual verbal argumentation was measured with the Robertson Intellectual Conflict Approach/Avoidance Measure. Data on class participation were gathered through direct observation by the Robertson Interaction Analysis System, self-reports, and teachers' reports. Results indicated that general assertiveness was positively related to self-report of participation, but not to observed participation. A low but significant correlation was found between liberal sex role attitudes and self-report, but not between observed behavior. HPW were more likely to have positive attitudes toward engaging in intellectucal argumentation than were LPW. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SELECTED ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES TO VERBAL CLASS PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE COLLEGE STUDENTS[1]

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Robertson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Angelika Robertson
Smith College
School for Social Work

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED199267

Introduction

The impetus for this study came out of the accumulating body of evidence for sex differences in language use, in particular the rather consistent finding that, in task-oriented groups, women speak up less frequently than do men (Aries, 1974; Bernard, 1972; Hilpert, Kramer, & Clark, 1975; Parker, 1973; Soskin & John, 1963; Strodtbeck & Mann, 1956; Ziman, 1974). This finding does considerably more than destroy an old myth about women's supposed garrulity. It points to what is perhaps a key explanatory variable for the unfavorable conditions that women face in so many spheres of life. Commen sense alone suggests that the less active a member of the group, the less likely he or she will exert influence on the group and its decisions. Research bears out this conclusion: the more a group member speaks, the more likely he or she will influence the group, be considered to demonstrate expertise, and be regarded as a leader (Bales, 1970; Lara, Vaughn & McGinnes, 1960; Morris & Hackman, 1969; Richardson, Dugan, Gray, & Mayhew, 1973; Zdep, 1969).

The extent and skill with which members of task-oriented groups engage in the competition between ideas, opinions, and interests thus bears a strong relationship to their ability to influence the outcome of group process. Decisions affecting the lives of women are constantly being made in such groups, whether they be boards of directors of a corporation, governmental councils, educational committees, community planning groups, juries, task

TM 810 163

[1] A paper presented at the New England Educational Research Organization Conference in Lenox, Massachusetts; April 30 - May 2, 1980.

forces, etc. While women are making progress toward increased representation in such groups, they are all too frequently handicapped in their effort to maximize their influence within such groups. When the interests and views of group members conflict, as they usually do, the ability for effective on-the-spot argumentation is vital to the exertion of influence.

An arena that is both fruitful and relevant for further study of this issue is the college classroom. As Barrie Thorne, co-author of the 1973 book of essays and annotated bibliography Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, expresses it, "Higher education is a talking trade" (Thorne, 1979). Students not only "trade" on their ability to express themselves, but they are also honing their skills for post-student life in the white-collar and professional world which is mostly even more of a "talking trade". The basic sex difference of men talking more than women has, of course, also been noted in the context of the college classroom (Lever & Schwartz, 1971; Parker, 1973; Robertson, 1978; Sternglanz and Lyberger-Ficek, 1977). A better understanding of the factors associated with this difference can provide guidelines for a "feminist pedagogy," for stuctures and activities which can promote the development of women's verbal skills at an important point in their lives, i.e., when they are on the threshold of their careers.

What explanations have been offered to account for this sex difference in language use? Do females generally suffer from a deficit in skills of verbal self-assertion or are they deprived by men of the opportunity to exhibit those skills? Without the presumed inhibitory influence of men, are women generally as able as men to speak up under pressure, to take risks in asserting themselves, to deal successfully with interruption, to pursue an argument against a forceful or even hostile opponent, to muster relevant facts under pressure, to sound persuasive even when in doubt, to retain composure

and even take pleasure in verbal combat? To be sure, there is evidence that men generally determine the nature and direction of conversation with women. This they do by interrupting more frequently (Zimmerman & West, 1975); they stifle conversation they are not interested in (Soskin & John, 1963; Zimmerman & West, 1975); they very rarely just quietly listen (Chesler, 1971). But men show these obstructionist behaviors as much to other men as to women -- and men deal with them more successfully than do women. However, when single-sex groups are compared, men exhibit even stronger tendencies to dominate, to challenge, and to engage in verbal sparring while women show no increase in assertive or argumentative style (Aries, 1974; Bernard, 1972; Hirschman, 1973; Legman, 1968; Mitchell-Kernan, 1972; Robertson, 1978; Sears, Ray & Alpert, 1965, Ziman, 1974). The evidence thus suggests that it is mostly not a question of men inhibiting women from doing what they wish to do. A more fruitful interpretation is that men and women perceive the nature and purpose of verbal exchange situations differently, play out different roles in such situations, and thus learn and practice different repertoires of skills.

A very general but useful framework for understanding these different attitudes and role conceptions is provided by the polarities of behavior described by Parsons and Bales (1955) as the expressive versus the instrumental. In analogous fashion, Bakan (1966) conceptualizes a difference between the thrust toward communion and the thrust toward agency. Thus, the expressive mode or the thrust toward communion manifests itself in verbal interaction styles which seek integration and harmonious relations within the group, which work toward co-operation and synthesis, which regard emotional involvement as appropriate to the task, and which are process-oriented. On the other hand, the instrumen-

tal mode, with its thrust toward agency in the service of the task at hand, uses the group as only a means to an external goal, promotes rationality and denies emotional involvement, seeks differentiation and analysis into component and distinct parts (persons, ideas, objectives), and is product-oriented.

Historically, women have been more inclined towards and adept at the expressive, process-oriented mode while men have tended towards the instrumnetal, task-oriented mode. The interactions in a typical college classroom discussion can be seen as demanding more of the skills related to the task-oriented mode than the expressive mode. Almost by definition, the academic pursuit of knowledge involves rationality, the rejection of emotionality, depersonalization. Verbal argumentation, a prime means of testing and developing ideas, is characterized by a competitive, critical stance which is quite the opposite of the supportive, co-operative, accomodating stance in which women tend to be more effective. No wonder then that men are generally more active participants in such verbal exchange.

In a world in which both men and women are trying to -- or need to try to -- expand their roles, they also need to expand their repertoire of skills, of modes of behavior. The ability of men and women to move effectively and competently between expressive and instrumental modes will have critical impact on their ability to take on the full range of roles in our society.

Fortunately, many women have already demonstrated their ability to function well in both expressive and instrumental modes. The generalizations about college women's ability to engage in intellectual discussion in the classroom context are instructive, but the next question in the analysis of the situation ought to be: why have some women succeeded in avoiding this traditional sex role limitation? While there is sufficient evidence to bemoan the fact of many women's reticence in the classroom, every teacher

can report frequent instances of women defying the stereotype. There are many women who can engage in active discussion and effective intellectual argumentation. The study which I am about to report was motivated by the conviction that more can be learned from looking at the differences among women than from developing more knowledge about differences between women and men. Instead of seeking to graft, as it were, the behaviors and skills of men onto the behaviors and skills of women, it is more fruitful to identify major factors associated with women's ability to assume active, assertive, leadership roles in the verbal exchange of task groups.

This study therefore looked at women only. It measured the extent of class participation of a group of college women and then sought to identify attitudes which are associated with high participation. The choice of attitudinal dimensions for study arose out of the theoretical framework just outlined. Verbal participation in a college-level seminar was seen as having sex role implications and thus the variables of general assertiveness, of feminist attitudes, and of attitudes toward intellectual verbal conflict were singled out for examination. The main questions which this study sought to shed light upon are:

1. Are high participant women more assertive in general than low participant women?
2. Do high participants hold more liberal views on women's roles than low participants?
3. Do high participants have a more positive attitude toward the process and purpose of intellectual argumentation?

Method

Female students in eight different, naturally-occuring seminar-type classes at four private, selective liberal arts colleges were observed for 30 minutes on two separate occasions. Half of the classes were mixed-sex,

half were all female; half were taught by male and half by female instructors. Courses were chosen to meet the following criteria: the subject matter was in the social sciences, courses were beyond the introductory level and thus included very few freshmen, and the number of enrolled students was between 10 and 20 students, and a major and explicit goal of the instructor was to engage students in discussion. A Flanders-type system of continuous coding of verbal interaction, developed by the author, allowed for the measurement of both frequency and length of each student's and the teacher's verbal contributions. The 70 female students who were present for both observations were then asked to come to one of several scheduled outside-of-class sessions to answer a lengthy questionnaire to provide attitudinal and other personal data. This procedure yielded a sample of 52 female subjects for whom both complete observational and complete attitudinal data were available.

Instrumentation

Data on class participation were gathered not only by direct observation but also by self-report and by teachers' reports. Thus, in addition to measures derived through direct observation by the Robertson Interaction Analysis System (Robertson, 1978), students were asked to rate the extent of their participation in the particular course observed, as well as their general tendency to participate in discussion-type courses. In addition, the teacher was asked, at the end of the course, to rate each student on extent of participation.

Attitudinal and other personal data were gathered by means of a test battery which included tests developed by other researchers, tests developed by the author, and a range of miscellaneous questions. Thus, assertiveness was measured with the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (Rathus, 1973); attitudes

towards women's roles were measured by the Spence-Helmreich Attitudes Towards Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973); and attitude towards intellectual verbal argumentation was measured with the Robertson Intellectual Conflict Approach/Avoidance Measure (Robertson, 1978).

Results and Discussion

This study assumed that students are characterized by a general tendency to participate which is displayed over a range of situational variations. Only such a general tendency can be meaningfully related to a broad range of attitudes. To test whether the existence of such a tendency is a reasonable assumption, whether two 30-minute time samples of behavior warrant inferences for general behavior, as well as to test whether self-reports of students are reasonably reliable, correlational analyses were done between the various participation measures. Indeed, inter-correlations were all positive and significant at the .001 level. Thus, the correlation between observed participation and self-report of general tendency was Pearson's $r(125) = .38$ (the large N is due to the fact that all students, both male and female, provided data on these measures); observed participation with self-report of participation in the course was $r(63) = .54$; observed participation with teacher-report of participation was $r(59) = .63$. Finally, the correlation between self-report on participation with teacher report of participation was .59 (59). Insofar as both the objective and subjective measures of participation have advantages and disadvantages, correlational analyses between behavior and attitude generally drew on both kinds of measures, with consistency of results increasing the confidence with which they could be accepted.

General assertiveness was found to be positively related to both self-

report of participation in the target course and reported general tendency to participate. However, correlations were low, $r(52) = .31$, $p < .01$ and $r(52) = .29$, $p < .05$, respectively. There was no relationship between observed participation and assertiveness. It appears therefore that the ability to assert oneself in general life situations is somewhat related to the ability to assert ideas, ask questions, and express disagreement in intellectual matters. The willingness to challenge, to risk disharmony, to confront, to take on a combative stance for the purpose of defending one's rights or one's point of view in either personal or intellectual matters appears to draw on a common fund of skills and attitudes. This has encouraging implications for training women to become more assertive in the classroom. Assertiveness training has a record of reasonable success in developing assertive skills, especially when particular areas of deficiency are identified and receive special attention (Gambrill & Richey, 1975; Rathus and Ruppert, 1973). The magnitude of the relationship between general assertiveness, as measured by the Rathus Schedule, and class participation, might be higher were it not for the fact that most of the situations described in the Rathus Schedule involve interactions with either a hostile individual or an impersonal establishment, such as a restaurant or a store. The behaviors which define an assertive individual, according to this measure, tend to be single interactions, rather than a process of an on-going relationship. It may be concluded therefore, that while many women find it possible to take on an instrumental role in a situation which does not present opportunities for the expressive mode, these same women are not necessarily able or willing to engage in instrumental modes of action in a context which invites the taking on of expressive roles as well. Thus, in a college classroom a cer-

tain identification with and caring about the group is likely to emerge which conflicts with tendencies for self-assertion and instrumentality.

The next issue which this research sought to address is the relationship between feminist sex role conceptions and the ability to manifest the traditionally more "masculine" behavior of intellectual self-assertion, as exemplified in class discussion. While a low but significant correlation was found between liberal sex role attitudes and the self-report of participation in the target course, (r = .31, $p < .01$), no relationship was found with observed participation behavior or with self-report of general tendency to participate. It appears therefore that holding feminist views does not necessarily imply that behaviors and skills to act on those views are present. Thus, while consciousness-raising of women towards more expansive conceptions of their roles and capacities may possibly be a first and necessary step towards the acquisition of a broader range of skills and behaviors, it is not sufficient. Indeed, as a group, the top 50% of participants had significantly higher scores on this measure of feminism that did the lower 50% of the participants ($t(48) = 2.10$, $p < .05$), which suggests that feminist attitudes, while not linearly related to amount of class participation, is nevertheless a distinguishing feature of high participants.

A major hypothesis for this research was that the meaning of intellectual argumentation both in and outside the classroom is construed differently by women who choose to engage in such argumentation and those who do not. Intellectual conflict was predicted to elicit an approach reaction from those who see it as a kind of game, with certain rules, one that provides the opportunity to practice skills, to test ideas, and to demonstrate intellectual competence, to be won or lost, to be entered again at will, with no implications for personal worth or for the quality of the socio-emotive relationship with

the opponent. Such a game produces tension and excitement which is basically pleasurable and does not touch on a person's sense of fundamental worth or integration with others. On the other hand, intellectual conflict can be seen as a personalized fight, eliciting hostile feelings, and threatening mutual trust, esteem, and caring. In this type of fight the focus of the verbal exchange is not so much on the intellectual issue at hand but on the emotional relationship between opponents. The aim is not to bring ideas to the test but to destroy the opponent's sense of self-esteem by showing him or her up to be incompetent. Such a meaning construction of intellectual argumentation would tend to elicit an avoidance response.

In order to test whether such a conflict approach/avoidance construct has validity, the author developed a 35-item scale, the Robertson Intellectual Conflict Approach/Avoidance Measure (Robertson, 1978). In a pre-test with 148 college students this scale achieved a Cronbach's alpha of .91, indicating that the items measured a common dimension; the correlation between total score and self-report of general class participation tendancy was .46 ($p < .01$), indicating reasonable external validity of the measure. Items in this measure addressed the following themes: enjoyment of discussion, preference for the oral mode over the written mode in developing ideas, self-confidence and lack of fear about exposing ideas to criticism, receptivity to intellectual controversy, interest in exchange and criticism of ideas with peers.

Correlational analyses of scores on this Intellectual Conflict Approach/Avoidance Measure with the various participation measures showed that high participants were indeed more likely to have over-all positive attitudes towards engaging in intellectual argumentation. Pearson's correlations

with the Approach/Avoidance Measure were : with observed participation, $\underline{r}(52) = .26$ ($\underline{p} < .05$), with self-report for the course, $\underline{r} = .45$ ($\underline{p} < .01$); with self-report of general tendency to participate in class discussions, $\underline{r} = .43$ ($\underline{p} < .001$); and with the teacher's report of students' participation in the course, $\underline{r} = .40$ ($p < .01$). Analysis of individual items which correlated significantly with the measure of general tendency to participate, here the most appropriate measure since attitudes tapped related to discussion in general, revealed the following themes. High participants tend to have a more positive attitude not only to their own participation in discussion, but also to such participation by peers. They tend to prefer the oral, spontaneous mode of presenting and discussing ideas in the group context than the more private mode of developing and expressing ideas on paper. High participants also had more confidence they had something worthwhile to say, that they can say it well, even when under pressure of being examined and evaluated by superiors. They were also more willing than low participants to submit their ideas to criticism, believing that such criticism serves a good purpose. Not only is there no fear of disagreement by peers, but also a readiness to match wits with an authority figure, such as the professor. Other significantly correlated items revealed that low participants, as opposed to high participants, tend to regard their peers' comments with impatience and disdain, considering student input as a waste of time. One item asked subjects to indicate agreement or disagreement with this statement: I prefer making my comments to the professor after class to expressing them in class. High participants,who tended to disagree strongly, reflect an attitude that student input is an integral and appropriate part of the exchange of ideas and opinions in a class setting; those students who wait to speak to the professor after class seem to see no value or reward for them-

selves or others in speaking to the class as a group.

What implications for educational practice can be derived from these findings? It appears that many female students can conceive of only two options of relating to the group in a college seminar. The group is either seen as a community of people whose purpose is to establish harmony and good feelings, to relate supportively to one another, and to subordinate strivings for personal academic advancement and distinction to the unity and cohesion of the group. When the impossibility or inappropriateness of such goals is discovered, as when some students engage in criticism of others' ideas, or "show off" their superior knowledge, or express provocative, controversial points of view, the group comes to be perceived as a dangerous and hostile environment. Avoidance of participation, both literally and figuratively, is the result. It is as if these students feel betrayed and now see their classmates' participation as, at best, obstructionist, and, at worst, as destructive competitive behavior. The option left for such students is to screen out, as much as possible, the presence and contributions of peers and to focus instead on the teacher. (When no one in the group stirs things up and everyone agrees to agree, the result is the same: no discussion at all and dutiful listening to the teacher.) This focus on the teacher is genrally indicative of a dependent, deferential learning style, in which the object is to please the teacher. This is usually done by passive listening, by avoiding the risk of disagreement, and by displaying knowledge on papers and exams.

There is, of course, a third option, one which high participants tend to perceive and choose. The group's task is interpreted by them as a joint, dynamic ferreting out of academic knowledge and of banishing error, in which the outcome is not emotional harmony but mutual enlightenment. The socio-emotive concerns of the group's members are largely put aside as irrelevant

to the task, and the battle of ideas -- in which the teacher is usually understood as just another footsoldier -- is engaged. Many women and men experience in this a new and different kind of camaraderie, one that also results in good feelings about one another and often leads to a final sense of relatedness and mutual respect among the "warring parties." And even if these good feelings do not ensue, the undaunted "quest for truth" is considered a more appropriate purpose of class discussion than the promotion of emotional well-being.

How can this third option, participation in the creative battle of ideas, be made more accessible and attractive to more women students? A combination of consciousness-raising about the issue, of training and practice in argumentation skills, and of psychological support for dealing with fears and distress might well succeed. A series of mini-courses for freshmen -- not only for women but also for men who find it stressful to speak up in class -- might profitably be instituted in which the importance of developing argumentation skills, both for the college context and for later professional life, is stressed, where fears and anxieties can be safely aired, experiences can be shared, argumentation practice with constructive criticism can be provided, intellectual risks can be taken in relative safety, and where a climate of expectations can be developed which is more conducive to the constructive battle of ideas. In regular college classes instructors could also work more actively and explicitly to promote class discussion by addressing the underlying attitudes that are associated with reticence, and by structuring more opportunities for intellectual verbal game playing.

The question may be raised as to whether women who participate actively in class discussion tend to be more intellectually engaged with the subject and/or tend to be the more capable students. If low participants simply have nothing to say, one does not need elaborate psychological explanations for why

they remain silent. To address those questions, subjects were asked whether the course in which they were observed was in their major field. A *t* test was run to determine whether students for whom the course was in their major tended to speak up more than students for whom it was not. The results showed no significant difference in participation for majors and non-majors.

As for the relative intellectual competence of high and low participants, teachers were asked, after the course had ended, what grade students had earned on papers, on written exams, and for the course. When these grades were submitted to correlational analyses with participation measures, some interesting results emerged.

The grades students received on papers showed no relationship to either observed amount of participation or to students' self-report of participation in the target course. However, there was a positive correlation of .48 ($p < .001$) for grades received and the teacher's report of amount of participation. The relationship between grades received on written exams and amount of participation was somewhat different: no correlation was found with students' self-report, but a relatively high correlation was found with both observed participation and the teacher's participation report ($r = .60$ for both relationships, with $p < .001$). The final course grade which students had achieved was positively correlated to a low degree with observed amount of participation ($r = .32$, $p < .01$) and to a considerably higher degree with the teacher's participation report ($r = .61$, $p < .001$), while no relationship was evident with students' self-reports.

Given these mixed results, what can be concluded? Only the teacher's report of participation showed consistently high positive correlations with grades earned. This may, of course, represent a significant relationship between two independent measures. However, when it is considered that teachers were asked to report on their students' participation levels after the course

had ended and grades had been assigned, it becomes reasonable to ask whether teachers' overall impressions of students' intellectual competence -- as evidenced by grades given -- influenced teachers' recollections of the amount that students actually participated. That is, good students' participation might well have been over-estimated and less good students may be remembered as relatively more silent than they actually were. Such a possible bias tells us something important: teachers may well associate good intellectual performance with speaking up in the classroom. An alternative explanation is that students who spoke up a reasonable amount were more likely to be perceived as competent and thus were graded more highly than students who did not draw favorable attention to themselves through at least moderate participation. Either way, it appears to pay to speak up in class.

If we disregard teachers' participation reports because of likely bias what can we conclude from our other sources of participation data? If students' self-reports are to be considered more reliable indicators of actual participation, we must conclude that speaking up in class bears no relationship to the ability to write papers well, to think and write under the pressure of exams, and to overall performance in class as reflected in the final course grade. On the other hand, if the observed amount of participation during the sample 60 minutes of class time is considered a more reliable indicator of participation, then we draw other conclusions. Again, it appears that paper-writing ability has no relationship to speaking up in class. But the ability to think rapidly and to express oneself effectively under the pressure of an exam was highly related to amount of class participation. Finally, course grades were also correlated positively with observed participation, supporting the notion that teachers, in assigning final grades, take into consideration the frequency with which students participated in class dicussions. None of these analyses

answer our question about the relationship between intellectual competence and class participation in definitive ways. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that class participation is positively related to perceived intellectual competence -- i.e., teachers assign higher grades to those who speak up in class.

This line of thinking brings us back to the point made in the introduction to this paper, namely that active participants in task groups come to be perceived as more capable individuals than inactive members. While in the college setting an individual usually has the opportunity to alter that impression by demonstrating his or her capability in written form, in many decision-making talking groups outside of the school context there is no such opportunity. "What you hear is what you get." The ability to think on one's feet is critical. The extent to which women have had little practice and encouragement to develop this skill, to that extent they are seriously hindered in their effort to gain recognition and influence. The results of this study suggest that while some key aspects of the women's movement, such as the dismantling of outmoded and constrictive beliefs about women's rights and roles in our society and the emphasis on the acquisition of more general assertiveness in women, bear some relationship to the ability of women to engage actively in the verbal battle of ideas, there exists a need for more focused attention to and training for this ability.

The problem is real: 41% of female subjects in this study never once spoke up during the observed discussion sessions. But chances for solving the problem are encouraging: 60% of female subjects professed a desire to become more active in discussions. The context of the college classroom, then, provides an excellent opportunity to both study and tackle the problem of women's reluctance to enter the fray of ideas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aries, E. Interaction patterns and themes of male, female and mixed groups. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, New Orleans, August, 1974.

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

Bales, R. F. Personality and interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Bernard, J. The sex game: Communication between the sexes. New York: Atheneum, 1972.

Chesler, P. Marriage and Psychotherapy. In the Radical Therapist Collective, Eds., produced by Jerome Agel, The Radical Therapist. New York: Ballantine, 1971.

Gambrill, E. D., & Richey, C. A. An assertion inventory for use in assessment and research. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 6, 550-561.

Hilpert, F., Kramer, C., & Clark, R. Participants' perceptions of self and partner in mixed- sex dyads. Central States Speech Journal, Spring, 1975.

Hirschmann, L. Female-male differences in conversational interaction. Paper presented to the Linguistic Society of America, December, 1973.

Lara, R. E., Vaughan, W., & McGinnies, E. Leadership and friendship status as factors in discussion group interaction. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 52, 127-134.

Legman, G. Rationale of the dirty joke: An analysis of sexual humor. Castle Books, 1968.

Lever, J., & Schwartz, P. Women at Yale: Liberating a college campus. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971.

Mitchell-Kernan, C. Signifying. In A. Dundes (Ed.), Mother wit from the laughing barrel. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Morris, C. & Hackman, J. R. Behavioral correlates of perceived leadership. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 350-361.

Parker, A. M. Sex differences in classroom intellectual argumentation. Unpublished master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1973.

Parsons, T. & Bales, R. F. Family, socialization and interaction processes. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

Rathus, S. A. A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 1973, 4, 398-406.

Rathus, S. A., & Ruppert, C. Assertion training in the secondary school and the college. Adolescence, 1972, 7, 128-135.

Richardson, J. T., Dugan, J. R., Gray, L. N., & Mayhew, B. H. Expert power: A behavioral interpretation. Sociometry, 1973, 36, 302-324.

Robertson, A. The relationship of class sex composition, teacher sex, and selected attitudinal variables to the verbal class participation of female college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1978.

Sears, R. R., Ray, L., & Albert, R. Identification and Child Rearing. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Soskin, W. F., & John, V. P. The study of spontaneous talk. In R. Barker (Ed.), The stream of behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. The attitudes towards women scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes towards the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. Journal Supplement Abstract Service of the American Psychological Association, Ms. No. 153, 1972.

Sternglanz, S. H., & Lyberger-Ficek, S. Sex differences in student-teacher interactions in the college classroom. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 345-351.

Strodtbeck, F. L., & Mann, R. D. Sex role differentiation in jury deliberations. Sociometry, 1956, 19, 3-11.

Thorne, B. Claiming Verbal Space: Women, speech, and language in college classrooms. Paper presented at the Research Conference on Educational Environments and the Undergraduate Woman, Wellesley College, September, 1979.

Thorne, B., & Henley, N. Language and sex: Difference and dominance. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1975.

Zdep, S. M. Intra-group reinforcement and its effects on leadership behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance., 1969, 4, 284-298.

Ziman, A. The politics of conversation: What are the sex differences? Unpublished paper for course entitled "Sex and Politics" at Hampshire College, 1974.

Zimmerman, D., & West, C. Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne and N. Henley (Eds.), Language and sex: Differnce and dominance. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1975.